2 applications relating to Ballia District and 7 applications relating to Jaunpur District of Uttar Pradesh were pending for the grant of industrial licence to set up industrial units in the said districts.

As per the new Industrial Policy, industrial licensing has been abolished for all projects except for a short list of industries related to security and strategic concerns etc. The proposals requiring industrial licensing are at various stages of processing as per established proce, dure.

Licence to M|s. Apex Traders Pvt. Ltd,, Sahibabad

1600. SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Will the Minister of FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a tact that an F. P. O. licence has been issued by the Director (F and VP Department of his Ministry) to M|s. Apex Traders Pvt. Ltd. Sahibabad on 6th June, 1991 with the condition that no products licensed by Pepsi Foods will be allowed to be manufactured;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor;

(c) whether this condition is being incorporated in every FPO licences granted to Sweet and Aerated Water Manufacturers and if so, since when;. and

(d) whether any new bottling units licgnsed to manufacture Pepsi products have been put up and if so, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE (IN DEPENDENT CHARGE) OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD PROCES SING INDUSTRIES (SHRI GIRI DHAR GOMANGO): (a) to (d) The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

Per Head Central Allocation to States

1601. MAULANA OBAIDULLAH. KHAN AZMI: Will the Minister of PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION be leased to refer to the answer to Starred Question 170 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 25th July, 1991 and state:

(a) the details of per head central allocation to different states and Union Territories State-wise during the last two years year-wise, and during the current year;

(b) whether it is a fact that there is a manifold difference in the pen head allocation to some States as compared to that of U.P. and Bihar;

(c) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(d) the steps being taken to ra tionalise the gap and to ensure bal anced growth and development of all States?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN DEPENDENT CHARGE) OF THE, MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRI H. R, BHARDWAJ): (a) State-wise and U. T.-wise per head Central allocations during 1989-90, 1990-91 and 1991-92 are shown in the Statements I and II attached respectively.

(b) to (d) No. Sir. Some varia tions rejected in the allocations of U.P. and Biher compared to other-non-special category States are for 1989 90 and 1990-91 is due to their relative shares emerging on the basis of the modified Gadgil Formula approved by N D.C. in August. 1980 and the revised formula declared as consensus formula in the National Development Council meeting held in October, 3990 for the allocations during the Eighth Plan 1990-95 including 1991-92. Allocations to Special Category States are based on the judgement of their needs, not made according to criteria and comeout of the lump sum amount specified out of the total. Non-special category, States including U.P. and Bihar having per capita income below the national average got favourable treatment in the allocations. In the ease of Goa which obtained its Statehood in February, 1987, marked variation is because of Central assistance allotted on adhoc basis during 1987-88 to 1990-91.